DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 432 125 EF 005 469

TITLE	Interagency Use of Public Facilities: Maximizing Dollars and Space. Final Report on a Cooperative National Conference.
INSTITUTION	Council of Educational Facility Planners, International, Columbus, OH.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.; Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1982-00-00
NOTE	37p.
CONTRACT	G008103973
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Agency Cooperation; *Cooperative Planning; Financial Support; *Public Facilities; Research Needs; *Space Utilization
IDENTIFIERS	*Cost Containment

ABSTRACT

A final report is provided outlining a cooperative effort on the part of national groups to resolve the needs of communities through shared facility use and interagency cooperation. The report's first section presents the pre-conference written descriptive of each issue and selected background materials which provided conference participants a framework for initiating the conference discussions. The second section presents the conference findings, recommendations, and suggested strategies. Appendices provide the conference process overview, conference agenda, a list of attendees, and the generic resolution in support of the concept of interagency use of public facilities. (GR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 432 125

FINAL REPORT
ON
A COOPERATIVE NATIONAL CONFERENCE

Interagency Use of Public Facilities

MAXIMIZING DOLLARS AND SPACE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CONFERENCE CO-SPONSORS

- American Association of School Administrators (AASA)
- Association of School Business Officials (ASBO)
- The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)
- Center for Community Change (CCC)
- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)
- Council of Educational Facility Planners (CEFP)
- The Council of State Governments (CSG)
- International City Management Association (ICMA)
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
- National Association of Counties (NACo)
- National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP)
- National Association of Neighborhoods (NAN)
- National Association of Pupil Personnel Administrators (NAAPA)
- National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE)
- National Community Education Association (NCEA)
- National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL)
- National Governors Association (NGA)
- National League of Cities (NLC)
- National School Boards Association (NSBA)
- National School Public Relations Association (NSPRA)
- National School Volunteer Programs, Inc. (NSVPI)
- Stimulating the Neighborhood Action Program (SNAP)
- U.S. Department of Education (USDE)

EF 005 469

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Council of Educational Facility Planners, International
29 W. Woodruff Avenue, #325
Columbus, Ohio 43210
614/422-1521

Dwayne E. Gardner, Executive Director
Harry L. Pelley, President
Wendell V. Locke, Past President
William Griffith, President-Elect

1982

The project presented herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the U.S. Department of Education. The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement by that Department should be inferred.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FINAL REPORT
ON
A COOPERATIVE NATIONAL CONFERENCE

Interagency Use of Public Facilities

MAXIMIZING DOLLARS AND SPACE

Prepared by
The Council of Educational Facility Planners
in cooperation with
all conference co-sponsors

Developed through a grant awarded to
The Council of Educational Facility Planners, International

Dwayne E. Gardner, Executive Director
Michael L. Collins, Project Director

Grant #008-103973

Funded by the U.S. Department of Education under Title VIII
of the Community Schools and
Comprehensive Community Education Act of 1978, (P.L. 95-561)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

Foreward

The concepts of shared facility use and interagency cooperation are timely topics for study. These are times of declining enrollment, inflation, and shrinking fiscal resources. Those who deliver social services to individuals and communities often feel the greatest pinch. It is crucial that today's planners, administrators, educators and social service agency representatives address these issues which face us all. What has been their impact on social service delivery, and what steps must be taken to insure that we will continue to provide the best possible service to the greatest numbers? The United States Department of Education commends the Council of Educational Facility Planners, and the many participating organizations, for their efforts to address these difficult but important questions.

It is not nearly the subject matter, however, which makes this project so important. Rather, it is the arena in which it operates. A problem solving process has been used at the national level, by concerned representatives from several national organizations, to address an issue of national significance. It represents a cooperative effort on the part of national groups to address the needs of communities through shared facility use and interagency cooperation.

This important first step of convening national organizations to address an important issue must not be stifled by inaction. The organizations which were involved in the initial stages must now adopt a course of action. The proof of this project's impact will lie not in the number of individuals who read this product, but in the number of organizations that take their own advice, and develop a plan to promote agency coordination and the shared use of facilities within their ranks, and among their peers.

RON CASTALDI
DIRECTOR, COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	iii
PREFACE/SPECIAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION	1
(A) ISSUE DESCRIPTIONS	1
(B) SELECTED FACTORS	4
SECTION II: CONFERENCE FINDINGS	11
SECTION III: SUMMARY	16
APPENDICES:	
"A" - CONFERENCE PROCESS OVERVIEW	18
"B" - CONFERENCE AGENDA	23
"C" - LIST OF ATTENDEES	27
"D" - GENERIC RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE CONCEPT OF INTERAGENCY USE OF PUBLIC FACILITIES	30

PREFACE/SPECIAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The conference "Interagency Use of Public Facilities: Maximizing Dollars and Space" was a joint effort from its very origin. Evolving from a survey conducted in 1981, the twenty-three cosponsoring associations/organizations committed both themselves and staff time to the conference planning effort and its implementation. They therefore are to be given credit for the conference process and its findings.

The co-sponsors had as their purpose the actualization of a cooperative venture that would result in a set of recommendations and suggested strategies addressing the topic of public facilities that could then be disseminated to their memberships and others. The conference was designed to meet that purpose (see Appendix A for conference process overview).

Special acknowledgement is also given to the association/organization representatives who gave so much of their time and themselves to meet to discuss and work out conference arrangements, and to make the conference a productive reality. The representatives who served on the conference steering committee were:

- Effie Jones, Kathy Haller (AASA)
- Donald G. Buchan (ASBO)
- Kathy L. Schaub (ASCD)
- Julia Burgess (CCC)
- Rich Bagin (CCSSO)
- Michael Collins (CEFP)
- William Schneider (CSG)
- Nancy Stark (ICMA)
- Beverly Cole (NAACP)
- Mark A. Tajima (NACo)
- Edward Keller (NAESP)
- Marla Anderson (NAN)
- Charles M. Wilson (NAPPA)
- Cathlene Williams (NASBE)
- Jerry Walker (NCEA)
- William A. Harrison (NCSL)
- Evelyn Ganzglass (NGA)
- Robert Hill, William Harrison (NLC)
- Alan Shark (NSBA)
- Virginia Ross (NSPRA)
- Dan Merenda (NSVPI)
- Gloria Lawlah (SNAP)
- William W. Chase (USDE)

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Although there are numerous issues associated with the topic "Interagency Use of Public Facilities: Maximizing Dollars and Space", four issues were selected as focuses in order for the conference to be most productive. They were:

(1) the need for greater awareness and understanding of the concept of interagency use of public facilities

(2) the need for review and possible revision of current legislation and funding mechanisms that affect public facility utilization at local, state and national levels

(3) the need for research and documentation on the benefits and limitations of interagency use of public facilities

(4) the need for greater cooperation and communication between and among public agencies to maximize public facility usage.

This section presents the pre-conference written descriptive of each issue and selected background materials which provided conference participants a framework for initiating conference discussions.

(A) The Issues

ISSUE #1: THE NEED FOR GREATER UNDERSTANDING AND AWARENESS OF THE CONCEPT OF INTERAGENCY USE OF PUBLIC FACILITIES

Awareness and understanding of interagency use of public facilities have been limited by the perceptions of growth and abundance which American society held for so many years. Confronted with the challenge of identifying and/or constructing appropriate housing for a single agency alone was itself an awesome task during past periods of enormous population expansion. Thus, most public facilities have been developed for a single purpose such as school, library, town hall, recreation or senior citizen center.

Further, most public planning has been conducted with individual agencies working in isolation from one another which additionally perpetuates the singular nature of public facility usage. Recognition of the need for flexibility of space design to meet changing societal needs has been nearly nonexistent.

Our concern then is that many or most citizens, public administrators and decision makers are not really aware of the concept of interagency use of public facilities, its benefits or its limitations. They also lack a basic understanding of how this concept might be pursued in any given local setting. Thus we continue to find new community colleges, libraries, senior citizen centers, or other public facilities being built near comparable facilities abandoned by other agencies such as public schools.

The potential future need to recapture public facilities for their originally intended purpose, as well as the escalating costs of new construction and the declining value of the public dollar, suggest that the single purpose usage of public facilities may no longer always be possible.

The concept of interagency use of public facilities may not be appropriate in all situations; but citizens, public administrators and decision makers alike need to become more informed about the concept in order for them to better address contemporary public concerns in the present era of limited resources.

ISSUE #2: THE NEED FOR REVIEW AND POSSIBLE REVISION OF CURRENT LEGISLATION AND FUNDING MECHANISMS THAT AFFECT PUBLIC FACILITY UTILIZATION AT LOCAL, STATE, AND NATIONAL LEVELS

Most current laws and funding mechanisms were established prior to the phenomenon of declining fiscal resources and dramatically changing demographics. They, too, were designed for single purposes and often to serve specific population segments--e.g., the young, the elderly, the homeowner or the disadvantaged. Little or no recognition was given to the interdependence of people or to the fact that significant public concerns often require the involvement of diverse groups of individuals to resolve.

Although the intended purposes of many laws may not have been to prohibit the development of interagency projects, today they frequently serve as such constraints. Strict guidelines on use of capital funds, varying code requirements for different purposes, restrictions from commingling funds, and other such definitive measures create

numerous difficulties for interagency efforts.

The economic and political realities of the present era, however, have led some states to explore legislative changes to provide local governments with greater flexibility. A few have even enacted new legislation to substantively encourage local governmental units to work together.

This issue is not confined to the state level alone. Federal legislation, which in many cases does encourage interagency development in its language, is often impeded by rules and regulations which repress such efforts. Local governments also vary in the degree to which their policies and procedures facilitate interagency use of public facilities.

Laws are designed to address the concerns and the times in which they are created; and as an old legal proverb states, "When the reason for the law is changed, so is the law." Thus legislation needs to be reviewed, and possibly revised, in order to more adequately respond to the needs of public agencies working together to maximize public resources and better respond to public concerns.

ISSUE #3: THE NEED FOR RESEARCH AND DOCUMENTATION ON THE BENEFITS AND LIMITATIONS OF INTERAGENCY USE OF PUBLIC FACILITIES

Although there probably can be no hard and fast rules for all shared facility arrangements due to the unique needs of each situation and the agencies involved, it is logical to assume that certain activities and designs work better than others. Unfortunately, little is yet known; and what is known is only minimally documented.

Although several studies have been undertaken, particularly recently, there remain many questions as to the cost/benefits of interagency facility use, types of services which are compatible, and which management/governance structures are most functional. Research on such topics as design concepts that lend themselves to adaptable use of public facilities or the relative advantages/disadvantages of large, centralized, versus smaller neighborhood-based efforts, is also needed. Further, greater documentation of successful projects needs to occur.

Current interagency projects take many forms and involve varying numbers of public agencies and others. More such activity is likely to occur in the future. If we are

to have a more substantive base upon which to make such decisions, however, more comprehensive research and documentation of interagency use of facilities must occur.

ISSUE #4: THE NEED FOR GREATER COOPERATION AND COMMUNICATION BETWEEN AND AMONG PUBLIC AGENCIES TO MAXIMIZE FACILITY USAGE

It should come as no surprise that public agencies and organizations often have difficulty effectively communicating and cooperating with one another. Much of this difficulty is the result of what are referred to as the "Terrible Ts"--that is, time, turf, tradition and trust.

There is a legitimate concern that interagency efforts will require not only more time, but that they also may infringe upon agencies' purposes. Long accustomed to operating alone, public organizations find it not only hard to trust one another but also to believe that what they may give up by working together will be worth the effort. Yet, most of us do acknowledge that it is often possible to accomplish more collectively than we can accomplish alone.

Effective communication and cooperation are essential if interagency use of public facilities to maximize dollars and space is to become a reality. Thus we must find ways to break down the artificial barriers that we have created. Interagency commissions, special task forces, and joint meetings are examples of such efforts, but more needs to be done. Until public organizations learn to better communicate and cooperate between and among themselves, they will be limited in their ability to not only use public facilities most effectively and efficiently, but also in their ability to best address contemporary public concerns.

(B) Selected Factors

Several factors were identified which were felt to be significant to consideration of the topic "Interagency Use of Public Facilities: Maximizing Dollars and Space." They were:

- demographic trends
- surplus/excess and/or underutilized public facilities
- diminished resources and/or greater competition for available resources

- public opinions, attitudes and priorities
- documented efforts related to interagency use of public facilities
- perceived benefits of interagency use of public facilities

Demographic Trends

Demographers speak with a great deal of certainty about what the United States' population looks like today: how many of us there are, our ages and backgrounds, and how and where we live. They are also fairly confident about what the U.S. will probably look like five years from now. Beyond that, demographers are reluctant to be so definitive; the reason--unstable and constantly changing demographic trends. For example:

- The annual number of births is again increasing (3.6 million in 1980) after declining to 3.1 to 3.2 million (1973-1976) from a peak of 4.3 million (late 1950s-early 1960s)
- The population increased at a more rapid rate during 1980 (1.02 percent) than in any other year since 1970 because of increases in births and net immigration, including the refugees from Southeast Asia, Cuba and Haiti.
- In 1980, the effects of population shifts moved 17 congressional seats from the North to the South and West.
- The proportion of eligible adults who reported voting in the 1980 election (59 percent) was the same as in the 1976 election, at least temporarily ending a downward trend in voting participation.

- In 1980, three times as many unmarried couples were living together as were in 1970; and there was also an increase in the number of adults living alone.

- Female-headed families, averaging 50 percent lower incomes, increased significantly during the 1970s; and by 1980, over 20 percent of all children lived with only one parent.

- Fifty-two percent of all women were working in 1980, compared with 38 percent in 1960.

- About 7.1 percent of the workforce was unemployed in 1980, compared with 5.8 percent in 1979 and 8.5 percent in 1975. Current figures exceed 1975 levels.

- By 1980, 1 out of every 16 persons in the U.S. was of Spanish origin or decent; his or her median age was 22 years as compared with 30 years for the total population.

- It is estimated that by 1990, 80 percent of the population will be over the age of 18; with the proportion of those over 55 years of age continuing to increase.

- "Old" Suburbia, in 1980, had many of the same problems urban areas experienced earlier: costlier housing, an aging population, an influx of minorities, increased crime, drug abuse, and vandalism.

- Both Black and Hispanic populations increased above the national average during the 1970s: Black - 17 percent; Hispanic - 61 percent.

Surplus/Excess and/or Underutilized Public Facilities

It seems logical for communities eager to secure more return for their capital and operational investment dollars that the single-use public facility, coupled with its curtailed specialized time, is no longer affordable or necessarily desirable. Consider the following:

- It costs a great deal of money merely to keep a building open; using a reasonable estimate of $2 a year per square foot, if half of a 30,000 square foot building is unoccupied, the cost of maintaining the empty space is $30,000 a year.

- Energy costs, in some cases, are, in fact, reduced by extended use and greater occupancy of facilities.

- Public space is not only generally more affordable, but often more accessible to the people who are to be served by public programs and services.

- The sale or transfer of existing public facilities often precludes their recapture should they again be needed for their originally intended purpose(s).

- Control of public facilities is an asset upon which many or most public agencies often fail to capitalize; renting or leasing underused or vacant space can generate much needed revenue and/or in-kind support

- Compatible facility co-users have the potential for enhancing public agency efforts if their programs and/or services complement organizational goals.

Diminished Resources and/or Greater Competition for Available Resources

Contemporary concerns--unemployment, underemployment, inflation, changing demographics and behavior--challenge the traditional autonomy of public institutions as never before. The psychology of the times also cannot help but impact how public resources are used: bigger is no longer necessarily equated with better, the throw-away society is becoming obsolete, and the old habits of sprawl and waste are changing.

Consider the implications of the following:

- Propositions 13, 2½ and other referendum which impose limitations on taxes

- Federal, state and local budget cuts due to declining revenues and/or growing costs

- The evolution of "have" and "have not" states due to the inequitable distribution of scarce natural resources--e.g., oil and gas

- Other regional and/or local differences due to factors such as age, race, ethnic background, demographic trends, and/or technological expertise

- Increases in single interest groups and lobbying efforts directed at promoting private interests

Public Opinions, Attitudes and Priorities

Met with perceived bureaucratic inflexibility, limiting definitions, fear or lack of citizen involvement, increasing taxation, vested interests, and a false economy, citizens (taxpayers) are getting touch and demanding accountability from politicians and educators.

Such attitudes are reflected in

- the decline in confidence of many of our public institutions compounded by a weakened national economy
- resulting tax limitation proposals
- the frustration and possible ineffectiveness of many public employees no longer secure in their positions and/or threatened with little, if any, increases in compensation or advancement
- the ever-increasing concern for national security and prosperity
- greater attention to the elderly and less to the young due to the dramatic demographic shifts
- the conflicts between and among special interest groups seeking a greater share of the public pocketbook

Documented Efforts Related to Interagency Use of Public Facilities

Numerous examples exist of both contemporary and historical efforts to encourage interagency use of public facilities to address public concerns. The following provide but a limited sample:

- The National Playground and Recreation Association was established in the early days of this century for purposes of promoting recreation through the public schools and playgrounds.
- The Evening School for Workers Project, the Tennessee Valley Authority, Civilian Conservation Corp, National Youth Administration, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Works Progress Administration, as well as numerous other national and local efforts, have used schools and other public facilities to effect their programs

- On August 21, 1974, the Education Amendment of 1974 was signed into law, which, among other things, called for expanded utilization of existing public facilities

- The Community Schools and Comprehensive Community Education Act of 1978 (Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1978) placed strong emphasis on the use of public facilities as community centers by local education agencies in conjunction with other agencies in a community.

- The state of New Jersey has recently considered legislation which prohibits any public agency from building new facilities without first considering the availability of other public facilities; it also passed financial incentives for interagency projects.

- Florida has passed legislation which give preferential treatment to multi-agency projects; several other states have moved, or are moving, in that direction.

- In a related area, Florida has also moved toward improved local government cooperation and coordination by permitting municipalities to make agreements among themselves without approval from the State's Department of Legal Affairs.

- Among areas for which the Mississippi legislature established procedures for intergovernmental cooperation among local, state, and federal agencies is that of "public facilities".

- During the 1970s, several facilities were designed to specifically house multi-agencies; examples include the Human Resources Development Center in Hamilton, Tennessee, which houses forty public and private agencies; and the Washington Highlands Community School Complex which contains an elementary school, a health and recreation agency, a welfare center, and a cultural center.

- The former Fairmount Theatre in New York City is serving as neutral territory for an interagency alliance; in it are housed an elementary school, a community theatre, a cultural museum, and the office of the superintendent of schools.

- A recently closed elementary school in Acton, Massachusetts, is being rented to a nursing service agency and a gymnastics clinic in order to provide the town some income and allow additional time to make a decision on the future use of the facility.

- In West Hartford, Connecticut, the Town Council voted to keep the Old Hall High School for use by the town and school administration; the senior center may also be moved there.

Perceived Benefits of Interagency Use of Public Facilities

An extensive review of the literature indicates that there are at least five primary benefits of interagency use of public facilities: (1) facilitation of referral, (2) participant advocacy, (3) finances, (4) superior service delivery, and (5) synergy. These suggest that by housing different agencies under one roof:

- there can be greater probability of agencies working more closely and eliminating duplication --that is, physical integration can lead to functional integration;

- clients can be provided one location to obtain assistance for both educational and social needs;

- facilities can be better utilized due to the sharing of common areas such as offices, conference rooms, cafeterias, and restrooms and to increases in the number of hours and days facilities are used;

- public interest is focused on a single area which demonstrates to the taxpayer that facilities, paid for by them, are truly for their benefit all hours of the day, 365 days a year;

- space costs can be reduced for individual agencies thus allowing more resources to be used for staffing and programs;

- better and more economic maintenance of areas and facilities can be provided;

- diverse funding packages can be possible.

SECTION II: CONFERENCE FINDINGS

Recognizing the interrelatedness of the issues addressed by the conference, participants chose to present the conference findings collectively rather than issue by issue. Although unique observations, recommendations and suggestions may be more applicable to a specific issue or issues, it was the perception of those involved that such a format would provide a clearer picture of what needs to be done to make conference follow-up most effective.

General Observations/Clarifications

- "Public Facilities" means all public buildings, lands and real properties--not any one type such as school or park or municipal or state, etc.
- The effective and efficient use of public facilities is of concern not only to public agencies but also to the private sector and and citizens; therefore, citizens and others need to be involved in exploration and development of the concept of interagency use of public facilities.
- There is a need to be aware of, and respond to, concerns of institutions or groups presently charged with responsibility for one or more particular public facilities.
- There is a need to concentrate on state and local rules, regulations and policy since public facilities are generally regulated by those statutes and procedures
- The use of public facilities should be related to overall economic development and improvement plans.
- All forms of public institutions, and levels of government, seek to operate efficiently and effectively and may find they can better accomplish those goals by assisting, and cooperating with, one another.

- More needs to be known about the benefits, costs, and limitations of, and obstacles to, interagency uses of public facilities.

- To gain greater attention, the concept of interagency use of public facilities needs to be effectively marketed through the media, to the general public and relevant agencies and organizations.

- The private sector and those directly involved in public planning need to become more involved in exploration and development of the concept.

- Research on the costs/benefits, model legislation and other related documentation needs to be promoted.

- Mechanisms are needed at state and local levels for identifying, and making known, opportunities for sharing public space.

- A mechanism (or mechanisms) is needed to collect and disseminate data on the concept.

- Although the concept requires national attention, it is imperative that it be addressed at state and local levels as they are the levels where the concept is generally implemented.

- National direction (e.g., research & development and information dissemination) would encourage state and local attention and consideration of the concept.

- Strong leadership is needed to ensure research, promotion, and development of the concept.

- Flexible and adaptable criteria and procedures are needed to facilitate joint facility use efforts.

- Administrative directives and/or enabling legislation could increase the options for reuse and municipal use of public facilities.

- The way that interagency use of public facilities is considered and handled (process) will be critical to realization of its benefits.

- Commitment, coordination and visible public support will promote the concept.

- The work of the conference was important, and exploration of the concept of interagency use of public facilities to maximize dollars and space should be continued.

Recommendations

- Participants should report conference findings to their respective associations/organizations and spearhead dissemination activities to constituencies.

- A generic resolution supporting involvement in exploration of the concept of interagency use of public facilities should be developed for adaptation and adoption by each participating association.

- Conference co-sponsors and other associations/ organizations should be encouraged to adopt a resolution in support of involvement in exploration and development of the concept.

- A national consortium should be established to provide leadership to advance the concept and to establish a clearinghouse mechanism for collection and dissemination of relevant data (e.g., models, current data and trends, research findings, etc.)

- Conference co-sponsors should identify other associations/organizations to make more aware of, and to involve in, further exploration and development of the concept.

- State and local consortiums should be encouraged for effective consideration, and direction, of the concept at those levels.

- Conference co-sponsors, and other national associations/organizations identified, should assist state and local consortium development.

- Committed associations/organizations should join together to identify and solicit funding sources/ mechanisms to support research and cooperative efforts focused on exploration and development of the concept.

- Associations/organizations should be encouraged to develop individual and joint publications, conferences and workshops, and other informative sessions on the concept.

- State and local assessment of legislation, rules, regulations, and policies pertaining to facility use and multiple facility use should be encouraged.

- Conference co-sponsors, and other associations/ organizations identified, should be convened as soon as feasible to expand and develop further action-directed exploratory efforts related to the concept.

Suggested Strategies

The following are some of the strategies suggested by conference participants to promote and/or carry out the recommendations made:

- Personal calls by conference participants to recognized leaders to promote, and involve them in, concept and its development
- Encourage Governors to initiate action
- Identify and convene influential representatives to develop issue statement(s) on the concept and aspects (e.g., planning, funding, governance, etc.) associated with it.
- Use issue statement(s) to promote action (e.g., administrative directives, new legislation, etc.)
- Contact and involve marketing specialists and the media in developing informational materials and publicizing the concept
- Carry out on-going dissemination of information and research findings to advisory groups, community groups, policy makers, administrators and other decision makers, etc. (both internally --within associations; and externally--to other individuals/groups)
- Conduct demonstration projects (start small; work toward more complex efforts)
- Use concept as "theme" or topic at conferences, work sessions, seminars, etc. and/or for publications
- Conduct statewide inventory(ies) of public space to identify (a) amount and type/extent of utilization, and (b) excess/available space

- Conduct an inventory of legislation pertaining to the planning, funding, governance and use of public facilities; introduce and promote appropriate legislative amendments and/or enabling legislation

- Explore and develop both public/public and public/private funding mechanisms to support clearinghouse, shared use, and/or research and development efforts

- Secure agreement of agencies at each level to support joint planning activities; implement "interagency councils", "shared-use councils" or other forms of intergovernmental bodies

- Relate efforts associated with concept to local and other development plans (where appropriate)

- Establish mechanisms for coordinating both activities and resources at the decision-making levels; require examination of existing public space and overall public space needs prior to authorizing new construction and/or disposal of public facilities

- Identify, encourage and support research and development activities; collect and disseminate findings

- Identify and/or develop a process that involves the public in facility use planning

- Develop and use mass and interpersonal techniques and programs for the purpose of sharing information, and working on the concept's development; establish and activate a pool of knowledgeable presenters/speakers/facilitators.

SECTION III: SUMMARY

Participants at the national conference "Interagency Use of Public Facilities: Maximizing Dollars and Space" did more than endorse the need for and benefits of the concept of interagency use of public facilities; they also endorsed and expressed enthusiasm for the process of working together with one another and others to further the concept's development. In fact, the major overall recommendation that resulted from the conference points out the value participants gave cooperative efforts:

- Consortium(s) or partnership(s) should be established to provide leadership for the concept of interagency use of public facilities.

Other recommendations made by the conference participants were intended to either (1) promote the establishment of a consortium or consortiums or (2) direct consortium composition and activities.

Overall, conference participants were stimulated by the possibilities inherent in the concept of interagency use of public facilities and expressed commitment to furthering its awareness and consideration. Most also felt that the process used during the conference to address the interagency use of public facilities would also be applicable for consideration of other concerns of mutual interest.

Additional information and materials on interagency use of public facilities can be obtained by contacting the

Council of Educational Facility Planners (CEFP)
29 W. Woodruff, #325
Columbus, Ohio 43210
614/422-1521

Readers of this document and others are encouraged to send information on relevant activities, models, and examples which promote, explore, develop or implement interagency use of public facilities to CEFP.

APPENDIX

"A" — CONFERENCE PROCESS OVERVIEW

"B" — CONFERENCE AGENDA

"C" — LIST OF ATTENDEES

"D" — GENERIC RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE CONCEPT OF INTERAGENCY USE OF PUBLIC FACILITIES

APPENDIX "A"

CONFERENCE PROCESS OVERVIEW

The American Institute of Architects Building in Washington, D.C. was the site on May 27 and 28, 1982, for a cooperative conference entitled Interagency Use of Public Facilities: Maximizing Dollars and Space. Involved were representatives from twenty-three national organizations who joined together to share mutual concerns and to develop recommendations and strategies to encourage more effective and efficient use of public facilities and space. Because representatives from both the governmental and the educational arena participated, the conference provided a unique forum in which to address contemporary concerns related to public facilities.

Designed to be a working conference, background information and lectures were limited to providing participants with a base upon which to build suggestions and processes for maximizing use of public facilities through better coordination and communication.

The conference began with opening remarks concerning the societal, political, educational and demographic changes impacting the use of public facilities. Given by Dr. Paul Lutzker, Director of Public Affairs, Abramson Associates (Washington, D.C.), the descriptive overview emphasized changing lifestyles, population mobility, and the challenges generated for education and social services by both a

negative economy and citizen concern over economic excesses.

Following introductions of the conference co-sponsoring associations, and their representatives present, C. William Brubaker, FAIA, Executive Vice President, Perkins and Will, Chicago, Illinois, discussed the possibilities associated with adapting public facilities to new and/or multiple uses. Using an extensive slide presentation to demonstrate what has been, and can be, done, the architect stressed the flexibility of many contemporary structures. Brubaker concluded with the observation that new concepts for inter-agency use of public space could be developed that would not only improve the quality of education and the delivery of social services, but would also do so at lower costs.

Background on the four relevant issues selected as focuses for the conference was then presented. Joanne Goldsmith (NASBE) spoke on the need for awareness and understanding; Yale Stenzler (NGA) on the need for appropriate legislation and funding; Alan Shark (NSBA) on the need for research and documentation; and John Wherry (NSPRA) on the need for cooperation and communication relative to the concept of interagency use of public facilities. Their comments called attention primarily to four facts: (1) no national strategy currently exists to facilitate the concept of interagency use of public facilities; (2) interagency efforts involving the use of facilities, though increasing in

numbers, are not well documented or communicated to others not directly involved; (3) the public is not concerned about what agency(ies) is (are) involved as long as services are well provided; and (4) emphasis should be at state and local levels for solutions.

A buffet lunch followed after which participants separated into one of four groups:

(1) ISSUE #1: The Need for Greater Understanding and Awareness of the Concept
Facilitators:
- Julia Burgess (CCC)
- Mark Tajima (NACo)

(2) ISSUE #2: The Need for Review and Possible Revision of Current Legislation and Funding Mechanisms
Facilitators:
- Ed Keller (NAESP)
- Kathy Haller (AASA)

(3) ISSUE #3: The Need for Research and Documentation
Facilitators:
- Rich Bagin (CCSSO)
- Kathy Schaub (ASCD)

(4) ISSUE #4: The Need for Greater Cooperation and Communication Between and Among Public Agencies
Facilitators:
- Virginia Ross (NSPRA)
- Nancy Stark (ICMA)

After efforts to explore their particular issue in more depth, each group then went on to the challenging task of identifying recommendations and strategies for addressing that issue.

Before adjourning for the day, the participants reconvened to share the small groups' recommendations and

strategies, and factors that influence issue discussions (see Section II). A reception, hosted by the conference convener, CEFP, concluded the first day's activities.

A tentative report on the information presented, and the suggestions developed, during day one of the conference was then compiled by CEFP personnel, with NCEA support staff assistance, for distribution when participants reassembled the following day.

The concluding half-day session concentrated on identifying explicit actions that associations, individually or collectively, might take to implement the cooperatively developed recommendations. Participants separated into five small groups, each composed of both governmental and educational interests, to study and further explain the intent of suggestions contained within the tentative report and to make suggestions for conference follow-up. Facilitating the small group sessions were Maria Anderson (NAN), Don Buchan (ASBO), William Harrison (NCSL), William Harrison (NLC), Sylvia Jones (NASBE), Gloria Lawlah (SNAP), Joan Morris (NGA), Alan Shark (NSBA), Jerry Walker (NCEA) and Cathlene Williams (NASBE).

Reconvening again as a total group, the participants then clarified the conference findings and post-conference activity needs through reports from the small groups and open discussion. (See Section II.)

Ron Castaldi, Director of the U.S.D.E.'s Community Education Program which had provided a grant to support the

conference, then expressed appreciation of the work done by conference participants and assured the group of his department's continued interest and involvement relative to the topic of interagency use of public facilities to maximize dollars and space. He also challenged the participants to use a cooperative forum such as this to identify and resolve other issues in the future.

The conference concluded with remarks by Dwayne Gardner, Executive Director of CEFP, who reconfirmed CEFP's commitment to prepare and disseminate, with other co-sponsoring associations' assistance, a final conference report. CEFP staff, who facilitated overall conference activities, were Michael Collins, Bill DeJong and Leslie Duffey.

APPENDIX "B"

INTERAGENCY USE OF PUBLIC FACILITIES
MAXIMIZING DOLLARS AND SPACE

American Institute of Architects Building
Washington, D.C.

Conference Agenda

THURSDAY, MAY 27

8:30 A.M.	Registration/Coffee, Rolls and Conversation
9:00 A.M.	OPENING SESSION (Board Room)
9:00 A.M.	Welcome and Special Introductions • Dr. Dwayne Gardner Executive Director, CEFP
9:10 A.M.	Opening Remarks • Dr. Paul Lutzker Director, Public Affairs Abramson & Associates
9:50 A.M.	Recognition • Participating Associations - Introduction of Individual Association and Representatives in Attendance
10:15 A.M.	Interagency Use of Public Facilities: Maximizing Dollars and Space • Mr. William Brubaker, FAIA Senior Vice President, Perkins & Will Chicago, Illinois
10:45 A.M.	Refreshment Break
11:00 A.M.	Interagency Use of Public Space: Background Information and Issues • Ms. Joanne Goldsmith (NASBE) Awareness and Understanding • Dr. Yale Stenzler (NGA) Legislation and Funding • Mr. Alan Shark (NSBA) Research and Documentation • Dr. John Wherry (NSPRA) Cooperation and Communication

Thursday, May 27 (contd.)

11:55 A.M.	Review of Afternoon Activities
12:00 NOON	BREAK FOR LUNCH (provided)
1:00 P.M.	SECOND SESSION (Board Room)
1:00 P.M.	Review Instructions for Afternoon
1:25 P.M.	Break into Small Groups to Develop Recommendations (What) and Strategies (How)

- ISSUE #1: The Need for Greater Understanding and Awareness of the Concept
  (Board Room)
  - Facilitators:
    Julia Burgess (CCC)
    Mark Tajima (NACo)

- ISSUE #2: The Need for Review and Possible Revision of Current Legislation and Funding Mechanisms
  (Executive Dining Room)
  - Facilitators:
    Ed Keller (NAESP)
    Kathy Haller (AASA)

- ISSUE #3: The Need for Research and Documentation
  (Conference Room 1)
  - Facilitators:
    Rich Bagin (CCSSO)
    Kathy Schaub (ASCD)

- ISSUE #4: The Need for Greater Cooperation and Communication Between and Among Public Agencies
  (Conference Room 2)
  - Facilitators:
    Virginia Ross (NSPRA)
    Nancy Stark (ICMA)

Thursday, May 27 (contd.)

1:30 P.M.	Small Groups Convene (Locations as Indicated) • Facilitators - Introductions - Selection of Reporter - Development of Recommendations, Strategies, and Examples
3:30 P.M.	Break
3:45 P.M.	Reconvene/Small Group Reports (Board Room) • Reporter(s) from Small Group(s) - Review Discussion - Present Recommendations, Strategies, and Examples
4:45 P.M.	Summary of Day's Activities/Preview of Final Session
5:00 P.M. - 6:30 P.M.	RECEPTION (hosted) (Social Gallery)

******

FRIDAY, MAY 28

8:15 A.M.	Registration/Coffee, Rolls and Conversation
8:45 A.M.	CONCLUDING CONFERENCE SESSION (Board Room)
8:45 A.M.	Opening Comments/Review of Report
9:10 A.M.	Break into Small Groups

• Small Group #1: AASA, NACo, NSVPI, NCEA
(Board Room)
- Facilitators:
Marla Anderson (NAN)
Gloria Lawlah (SNAP)

• Small Group #2: ASBO, ICMA, NAESP, CCC, SNAP
(Board Room)
- Facilitators:
Cathlene Williams (NASBE)
Jerry Walker (NCEA)

Friday, May 27 (contd.)

- Small Group #3: ASCD, CSG, NSBA, NLC
  (Executive Dining Room)
  - Facilitators:
    Joan Morris (NGA)
    Don Buchan (ASBO)

- Small Group #4: CCSSO, NAACP, NSPRA, CEFP
  (Conference Room 1)
  - Facilitators:
    William Harrison (NCSL)
    William Chase (USDE)

- Small Group #5: NAN, NASBE, NCSL, NGA, USDE
  (Conference Room 2)
  - Facilitators:
    William Harrison (NLC)
    Alan Shark (NSBA)

9:15 A.M. — Small Groups Convene
(Locations as Indicated)
- Facilitators
  - Introductions
  - Select Person to Report for Group
  - Review Report
  - Record Additional Examples
  - Identify Explicit Actions which Associations, Individually or Collectively, May Take to Implement Recommendations/Strategies

10:45 A.M. — Break

11:00 A.M. — Reconvene/Small Group Reports
(Board Room)
- Reporter(s) from Small Group(s)
  - Review Discussion
  - Present Modifications (if any)
  - Report Suggested Actions by Association(s)

11:35 A.M. — Discussion, Comments, Follow-up

11:50 A.M. — Closing Remarks: Where Do We Go From Here?
- Dr. Dwayne Gardner
  Executive Director, CEFP

12:00 NOON — CONFERENCE ADJOURNS

APPENDIX "C"

INTERAGENCY USE OF PUBLIC FACILITIES CONFERENCE ATTENDEES

ORGANIZATION	ATTENDEE
AASA	John Colozzi Kathy Haller Charles Nunley Robert Peebles Roger Webb
APPA	Teresa B. Evans
ASBO	Donald Buchan Bill Day John E. Tritt William C. Ware
ASCD	Gordon Cawelti Benjamin P. Ebersole Kathy L. Schaub
CCC	Julia Burgess (Rev.) Mamie D. Williams
CCSSO	Rich Bagin
CEFP	Gail Ayers Dwayne E. Gardner W. Frank Johnson Harry L. Pelley
CSG	H. J. Hammer, Jr. Abbott Hilelson Stanley McCausland
ICMA	Jim Boston J. Hamilton Cambert Jim Cronk Anthony Griffin Nancy Stark
NAACP	Beverly Cole

ORGANIZATION	ATTENDEE
NACo	Elizabeth B. Cofield
	Nancy M. Davis
	Silas Kraft
	J. Hugh Nichols
	Mark Tajima
NAESP	Elaine Banks
	Alice D. Daum
	Bill Day
	Ted Greenleaf
	Edward Keller
	Nancy A. Poole
NAN	Marla Anderson
NASBE	George Asaki
	Joanne Goldsmith
	Sylvia Jones
	Judy Koloski
	Cathlene Williams
NCEA	Harry C. Allen
	Larry Decker
	Virginia Decker
	Jerry Walker
NCSL	Ron Field
	Bill Harrison
	Hattie Harrison
	Henry Haslinger
	Charles Parvis
	Rolin Sidwell
	Sandra Yoviene
NGA	Cecil F. Carter
	Leighton Cooney
	Evelyn Ganzglass
	Emory C. Harrison
	David Montford
	Joan Morris
	Yale Stenzler
NLC	William Harrison
	David L. Hildebrand
	William Washburn, III
NSBA	Doris Eugene
	Torill Floyd
	Barbara McCoy
	Alan Shark
	Claudia Waller

ORGANIZATION	ATTENDEE
NSPRA	Sydney Cousins
	Anne Emory
	Earl Jones
	Chuck Parvis
	Paul Rhetts
	Virginia Ross
	Phillips Schwartz
	John Wherry
NSVPI	Sarah Lahr
	Dan Merenda
SNAP	Burlon Boone
	Bernard R. Braddock
	Sheila P. Carpenter
	Brenda E. B. Dunson
	Patrick Jamison
	Gloria Lawlah
	Julianne Wade
	Donald Walker
USDE	Ron Butcher
	Ron Castaldi
	Laurel Cornish
	William J. Phillips
	Robert L. Schneider
	Gene Wilhoit
Overall Conference Facilitators: CEFP	Michael L. Collins
	William S. DeJong
	Leslie P. Duffey

APPENDIX "D"

RESOLUTION
(Generic Model)

TYPE: RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR THE CONCEPT OF INTERAGENCY USE OF PUBLIC FACILITIES

WHEREAS, facilities owned, controlled, or used by public institutions represent a tremendous capital and operational investment of public monies, and

WHEREAS, the efficient and effective use of such facilities is needed to ensure a maximum return from the public's investment, and

WHEREAS, significant, contemporary, public concerns often require the cooperative involvement of numerous public and private agencies, and

WHEREAS, examples of cooperative action and coordinated delivery of services are being sought by states and communities, and

WHEREAS, the interagency use of public facilities offers a means for (1) reducing the costs associated with housing public programs and services, (2) making public programs and services more accessible to the people who are to be served, (3) increasing community involvement in the development and delivery of programs and services, and (4) renewing confidence in the ability of public institutions to address and resolve public concerns, and

WHEREAS, the (association/organization) recognizes a need for further sharing of information, promotion of successful examples and collective action on the subject;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the (Board of Directors or other policy group) of the (association/organization) supports state and local activity related to the concept and practices of interagency use of public facilities and joint planning activities, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the (appropriate official) be directed to identify and pursue, both independently and cooperatively with representatives from other associations/organizations, activities that would enhance the maximum use of public facilities.